

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Pending before the Court is a motion to seal several exhibits submitted in relation to briefing on the pending motion for summary judgment. Docket No. 103; *see also* Docket No. 104. As directed by the Court, Plaintiff filed a supplement regarding potential redaction. Docket No. 109. Parties seeking to maintain the confidentiality of documents attached to dispositive motions must establish compelling reasons for sealing those documents. *See, e.g., Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 2006). Compelling reasons exist to seal the exhibits. *See, e.g.,* Docket No. 96 (finding compelling reasons to seal the Garff appraisal). Moreover, the Court finds that redaction would not leave meaningful information available to the public. *Cf. Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1137 (9th Cir. 2003). Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** the motion to seal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: September 25, 2015

  
NANCY J. KOPPE  
United States Magistrate Judge